REPORT RESUMES

ED 013 057 FL 000 547

FROM UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT TO PROFESSIONAL TEACHER. AN ASSESSMENT OF THE NDEA INSTITUTES FOR UNDERGRADUATES PREPARING TO BECOME ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

BY- AXELROD, JOSEPH
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSN. OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, N.Y.
PUB DATE 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.72 68P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MODERN LANGUAGES, *TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM, *PRESERVICE EDUCATION, *LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY, *TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, FLES TEACHERS, SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, QUESTIONNAIRES, COLLEGE STUDENTS, NDEA LANGUAGE INSTITUTES,

A STUDY WAS MADE OF SEVEN NDEA INSTITUTES, GIVEN IN THE SUMMERS OF 1965 AND 1966 FOR UNDERGRADUATES PREPARING TO BE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS, TO DETERMINE IF THESE INSTITUTES ARE AN EFFECTIVE SUPPLEMENT TO COLLEGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS. INFORMATION SOURCES FOR THE STUDY WERE INSTITUTE DIRECTORS AND THEIR STAFF, VISITORS' OBSERVATIONS, AND QUESTIONNAIRES. A SUMMARY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA, RELATED TO THE INSTITUTES AND HOME CAMPUSES, IS PRESENTED UNDER THE HEADINGS LANGUAGE SKILLS, FOREIGN CULTURE, LINGUISTICS, AND METHODOLOGY. THE DATA AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS ARE ASSESSED. A SAMPLE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, DETAILED RESPONSE DATA, AND 22 PAGES OF FREE COMMENTS FROM THE RESPONDENTS ARE INCLUDED IN THE APPENDIXES. (SS)

ED013057

FROM UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT TO PROFESSIONAL TEACHER

An Assessment of the
NDEA Institutes
for Undergraduates
Preparing to Become
Elementary or Secondary
Teachers of Modern
Foreign Languages

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Joseph Axelrod

FL 000 547

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA - 1967

The study reported herein was performed pursuant to
a contract with the Office of Education,
United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Preface

The assessment of the NDEA Institutes for undergraduates preparing to be teachers of modern foreign language is one of a series of institute studies which the Modern Language Association carried out during the summer and fall of 1966 under a consortium of professional associations which includes also the American Association of Geographers, the American Historical Association, the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction (NEA), and the International Reading Association. The assessment of undergraduate institutes was made with the help of Stowell Goding of the University of Massachusetts and under the guidance of Kenneth Mildenberger of the Modern Language Association.

May I take this opportunity to extend my thanks to the Directors of the 1966 foreign language institutes for undergraduates - Loretta A. Wawrzyniak, John D. Lindberg, Remigio U. Pane, and Kernan B. Whitworth, Jr. - for their hospitality and cooperation. I should like to further thank two members of Kenneth Mildenberger's staff, Jean Martin and John J. Adams, for their help. Finally I wish to thank Nobuo Kitagaki for his services in preparing the pages of this report for the printer's camera.

JOSEPH AXELROD
Project Chief

Contents

Preface.. i

I. BACKGROUND.. 1

II. QUESTIONNAIRE Analysis of responses: A study in contrasts.............................. 3

Training in the Language Skills.................. 3

Study of the Foreign Culture..................... 8

Linguistics...................................... 10

Methodology...................................... 12

Free Comments by Respondents..................... 16

Summary.. 17

III. ASSESSMENT.. 19

The Need for Undergraduate Institutes............ 20

Recommendations.................................. 21

APPENDIX A. THE QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT................. 23

APPENDIX B. THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE DATA.............. 29

APPENDIX C. A SAMPLING OF THE FREE COMMENTS WRITTEN ON THE ANSWER SHEETS................................ 40

APPENDIX D. A NOTE ON THE USE OF THE TERMS "POSITIVE" AND "NEGATIVE" IN SECTION II...................... 62

Section I

BACKGROUND

Institutes for undergraduates preparing to become elementary or secondary school teachers were introduced in the summer of 1965. Three such Institutes were given that summer, and four additional ones were given in the summer of 1966. All in all, thus far, there have been seven such Institutes, conducted on six different campuses: California (Irvine), Missouri, Northwestern, Rutgers, Texas, and Tufts. Each of the seven Institutes was visited, most of them by a team of two visitors. Visitors for the 1966 Institutes were Stowell C. Goding, Professor of French at the University of Massachusetts, and the writer. The primary concern of the visitors was to assess the effectiveness of the concept of the NDEA Institute authorization as applied to participants who are still in undergraduate school but preparing to become teachers of modern foreign languages in elementary or secondary schools.

Our data come from three sources: the written documents prepared by Institute directors and their staffs; our personal observation of the Institutes, including interviews with staff and participants; and the responses to a Questionnaire which the writer developed.

The Questionnaire is an instrument asking for 80 responses, 40 dealing with Institute features and activities, and 40 dealing with features and activities in the teacher-education program in the modern language field on the home campus of the participant. Responses were given anonymously. The percentage of returns was gratifying, for we obtained responses from over 90% of the 1966 participants and over 70% of the 1965 participants. Over a dozen answer sheets, unfortunately, arrived too late to be counted. Section II of this report presents an analysis of the Questionnaire responses and the four appendixes are all related to this instrument, its data, and their interpretation.

Modern Foreign Language Institutes, conducted under the National Defense Education Act, have been in existence since 1959. The evidence accumulated by evaluation teams from 1959 on, points unequivocally to the conclusion that each year the Foreign Language Institutes became better. After a few years, a general model was evolved which yielded a high degree of success when it was followed by a director and his staff - followed, that is to say, not slavishly but intelligently and creatively. After a few years also, the program began to have notable impact on the public schools, for over a third of the secondary school language teachers and a considerable number of elementary teachers were Institute graduates.

While the impact each year on the public schools has been greater, the influence of the Institutes has not yet been felt - at least not nearly to the degree the profession had earlier expected - on college and university curricula. The profession has learned a great deal about the training of language teachers through its Institute experience; but this knowledge has not yet been applied, with any visible results, to most of the teacher-education programs in the language field on the nation's campuses.

This was the conclusion reached by the 23-man 1965 MLA Study Project whose report, The Education of the Modern Foreign Language Teacher for American Schools, was published by the Modern Language Association in 1966. "Those responsible for the report," wrote Kenneth W. Mildenberger in the Foreword, "are concerned because the usual college curriculum for a language major, whatever its intellectual and spiritual values, too frequently does not adequately prepare the individual who is planning a teaching career in today's schools."

NDEA Institutes in the modern foreign languages, as a whole, have therefore an important role to continue to play in the education of language teachers for elementary and secondary schools; and, as subsequent sections will show, within that larger program, institutes designed for undergraduates preparing to become teachers of modern language have a unique role.

Section II

QUESTIONNAIRE

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES: A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

The body of the Questionnaire consisted of 40 items, each of which described an activity or feature commonly found at NDEA institutes in modern foreign languages. For example:

- Explored the principles on which the audio-lingual approach is built. (Item 7.)
- Those who needed it participated in "remedial" sessions for improving language skills. (Item 25.)
- Studied about masterpieces of art, music, history, philosophy, and science in the foreign culture. (Item 33.)

For each item, the respondent was to make two judgments. He was asked, first, to indicate the value to him of the particular Institute activity. (The Questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix A; the reader is asked to check there if he is interested in seeing the exact wording of the directions.) Second, the respondent was asked to focus on his own home campus and consider the training program there for prospective teachers like himself. He was then to indicate the degree to which that program required or encouraged the activity described in each of the items.

The data which the responses yielded (given in full in Appendix B) is summarized below under four headings: language skills, the foreign culture, linguistics, and methodology.

TRAINING IN THE LANGUAGE SKILLS

A basic goal of teacher preparation programs in modern languages is to help the student acquire a good practical command of the skills of understanding, speaking, reading, and writing. Institute programs have been built on the concept that training in these skills is more successful if an atmosphere is created which encourages continuous use of the foreign language by staff and students.

Questionnaire results show that - in the perception of the participants at the seven institutes for undergraduates - their institutes were able to establish this kind of learning climate while the programs for language majors on their home campuses were not able to do so. Here are the percentages of responses:

CONTINUOUS USE OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE APPEARS "NATURAL" - IN FACT, THE EXPECTED THING. (Item 21.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institute Programs...	97 %		87 %	
Home Campus Programs.		87 %		44 %

And the other side of the coin:

THE USE OF ENGLISH BY BOTH STAFF AND STUDENTS IS REDUCED TO A MINIMUM. (Item 35.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institute Programs...	98 %		92 %	
Home Campus Programs.		74 %		22 %

As a general rule, Institute programs follow the principal of homogeneous grouping of participants into small sections, according to students' linguistic proficiency. This principle, Questionnaire responses reveal, was a valuable one in the Institute training of the undergraduates but is a means which their home campuses are unable or unwilling to accept:

STUDENTS ARE PLACED IN SMALL SECTIONS ACCORDING TO THEIR PROFICIENCY IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE. (Item 36.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	91 %		75 %	
Home Campuses........		87 %		56 %

To help students acquire language skills more efficiently, the Institute programs often include remedial sessions for those who need them and opportunities for advanced work for those participants who are ready for them. Over half of the Institute participants revealed through their Questionnaire responses that they found these practices valuable and that such features do not exist to nearly the same degree in programs on their home campuses.

THOSE WHO NEED IT PARTICIPATE IN "REMEDIAL" SESSIONS FOR IMPROVING LANGUAGE SKILLS. (Item 25.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	57 %		36 %	
Home Campuses........		62 %		43 %

And for the more advanced participants:

THOSE WHO ARE READY FOR IT PARTICIPATE IN SESSIONS DOING "ADVANCED" WORK. (Item 26.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	56 %		33 %	
Home Campuses........		62 %		43 %

The Questionnaire responses show, therefore, that a contrast exists between Institute programs and home campus programs in three respects. There appears, first of all, to be a distinct difference in emphasis on training in language skills. There is, secondly, a difference in the "climate" which fosters the use of the target language and minimizes the use of English. Thirdly, there is a difference in such mechanical features of program as homogeneous grouping, small sections for drill work, remedial sessions, etc.

The foregoing descriptions have dealt with the overall pattern relating to language skills. We move now to the four specific language skills which teacher preparation programs in the modern language attempt to develop.

Listening and Speaking

Aural comprehension is not a "passive" skill which will automatically develop with training in speaking. A great amount of intensive and purposeful listening practice is needed in order to develop aural comprehension. The reason is that the skill must be highly enough developed to enable the prospective teacher to understand not only a native speaker who is lecturing from a platform or who adjusts his speed for conversation with foreigners; the prospective language teacher ought to understand two native speakers who are using the standard language and speaking naturally to each other. According to our data, the Institute programs tried to make provision for practice leading to this skill; programs on home campuses, however, it appears, do not as a general rule arrange courses of study in ways to make this possible:

THE SCHEDULE PROVIDES CONTINUOUS PRACTICE IN HEARING THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE FOR LARGE BLOCKS OF TIME EACH DAY. (Item 16.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	100%		97 %	
Home Campuses........		90 %		30 %

Sessions with native-speaking guest lecturers, which are characteristic of Institute programs, partly account for this reaction:

THE PROGRAM PROVIDES SESSIONS WITH NATIVE-SPEAKING GUEST LECTURERS. (Item 8.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	83 %		56 %	
Home Campuses........		74 %		38 %

The same general picture is revealed by responses to the Questionnaire items inquiring into training in the speaking skill. Institutes provide greater emphasis on this objective than regular teacher-education programs. Planners in both types of program find the objective an important one; both believe that the prospective foreign language teacher must learn to speak the language intelligibly and with an adequate command of vocabulary and syntax. But the regular campus programs are apparently not able to find the means by which this goal can be adequately implemented.

The Questionnaire asked about four major means: provision for continuous practice in speaking; the use of native-speaking instructional personnel; emphasis on training in phonetics, accompanied by individual correction; and the language laboratory. Responses on these items are indicated in the tables below:

a) Continuous practice in speaking:

THE PROGRAM PROVIDES CONTINUOUS PRACTICE IN SPEAKING THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE FOR LARGE BLOCKS OF TIME EACH DAY. (Item 4.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	99 %		95 %	
Home Campuses........		93 %		41 %

b) The use of native-speaking instructional personnel outside of class:

NATIVE-SPEAKING FACULTY OR INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS SIT WITH STUDENTS AS THEY CONVERSE DURING MEAL TIMES. (Item 28.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	97 %		85 %	
Home Campuses........		94 %		70 %

c) Training in phonetics:

THE PROGRAM PROVIDES A GOOD DEAL OF INSTRUCTION, WITH INDIVIDUAL CORRECTION, IN PHONETICS. (Item 14.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	83 %		57 %	
Home Campuses........		69 %		33 %

d) The language laboratory:

THE PROGRAM REQUIRES (OR ENCOURAGES) STUDENTS TO SPEND A GOOD DEAL OF TIME IN THE LANGUAGE LABORATORY. (Item 3.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	73 %		30 %	
Home Campuses........		64 %		22 %

Reading and Writing

The prospective teacher of foreign language must learn to read with immediate comprehension and without translating; and he must learn to write with reasonable correctness and clarity. Questionnaire data on these two skills show that reaction is positive in both Institute programs and in teacher training programs on home campuses.

a) Reading skill:

THE PROGRAM PROVIDES PRACTICE IN CLOSE READING OF LITERARY MASTERPIECES FROM THE FOREIGN LITERATURE. (Item 2.)

	Positive	Highly Positive
Institutes...........	66 %	43 %
Home Campuses........	81 %	55 %

b) Writing skill:

THE PROGRAM PROVIDES PRACTICE IN WRITING ESSAYS AND INFORMAL PAPERS IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE, WITH INDIVIDUAL CORRECTION. (Item 19.)

	Positive	Highly Positive
Institutes...........	93 %	69 %
Home Campuses........	56 %	19 %

Proficiency in the foreign language is clearly a basic goal for a teacher of language. But it is by no means sufficient. A good practical command of the language does not insure excellent teaching of that language. The following sections deal with knowledge in culture, linguistics, and methodology. These studies, too, play a fundamental role in the preparation of a language teacher.

STUDY OF THE FOREIGN CULTURE

A good language teacher must have a knowledge of the civilization of the people who speak the language he is teaching. His knowledge of the foreign culture is of two kinds. In the first place, he knows and appreciates the major cultural monuments in which members of the foreign culture take pride. These include the masterpieces of art, music, and literature. They include also the accomplishments of the great philosophers, religious leaders, historians, and scientists. In the second place, a good teacher of foreign language understands the values of the foreign culture; he knows the habits of thought and speech by which these patterns are reflected; and he knows something about the social institutions that also, in their own way, express those patterns.

Several Questionnaire items seek information on these very points.

a) Study of cultural masterpieces:

THE PROGRAM REQUIRES STUDY OF MASTERPIECES IN THE ART, MUSIC, HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE OF THE FOREIGN CULTURE. (Item 33.)

	Positive	Highly Positive
Institutes...........	63 %	30 %
Home Campuses........	64 %	36 %

b) Habits of thought and expression in the foreign culture:

THE PROGRAM EXPLORES THE HABITS OF THOUGHT AND EXPRESSION OF MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN CULTURE AND HELPS THE STUDENT UNDERSTAND HOW THEY TYPICALLY SEE LIFE AND THE WORLD. (Item 23.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	87 %		67 %	
Home Campuses........		60 %		21 %

c) Contemporary social institutions and value patterns:

THE PROGRAM INCLUDES STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE VALUE PATTERNS WHICH GUIDE DAILY BEHAVIOR IN THE FOREIGN CULTURE. (Item 34.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	78 %		51 %	
Home Campuses........		62 %		26 %

One item asked about attendance at plays, films, etc., closely related to the foreign culture:

> THE PROGRAM PROVIDES FOR ATTENDANCE AT PLAYS, CONCERTS, GROUP SINGING SESSIONS, ETC., WHICH ARE CLOSELY CONNECTED WITH THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND THE FOREIGN CULTURE. (Item 15.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes..........	92 %		66 %	
Home Campuses........		75 %		27 %

It appears from the responses to these items that home campus programs, as described by undergraduate Institute participants, compare favorably with Institute programs in the study of foreign cultural masterpieces, but that in other aspects of cultural study - habits of thought and expression of members of the foreign culture, contemporary social institutions, value patterns, etc. - a negative judgment of home campus programs must be made. In addition, provision for attending cultural events closely related to the foreign language and its culture appears characteristic of Institute programs but not of programs for prospective language teachers on the home campuses of Institute participants.

LINGUISTICS

A successful foreign language teacher knows about the nature of language in general and he is able to use with some ease the major tools that have been developed for analyzing and describing language. In particular, he has had some training in applying these tools to the language he is teaching and he has some understanding, as a result of such analysis, of its elements and structure. Above all, he has become familiar with contrasts in the structures and sounds of English and the foreign language. Questionnaire responses indicate that greater stress is placed on this aspect of the education of a prospective language teacher at the Institutes than at the home campuses:

> STUDENTS BECOME FAMILIAR WITH CONTRASTS IN THE STRUCTURES AND SOUNDS OF ENGLISH AND THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE. (Item 39.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes..........	94 %		80 %	
Home Campuses........		72 %		34 %

A sound training in linguistics would include discussions of the various theoretical approaches to grammar - for example, the traditional, structural, and transformational approaches - and would explore the strengths of each of these major kinds of grammatical analysis. Accordingly an item on the Questionnaire sought to collect data on this point:

> THE PROGRAM INCLUDES DISCUSSIONS OF DIFFERENT THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO GRAMMAR (e.g., TRADITIONAL, STRUCTURAL, TRANSFORMATIONAL) EXPLORING THE STRENGTHS PECULIAR TO EACH. (Item 40.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	80 %		47 %	
Home Campuses........		65 %		41 %

In the typical Institute pattern, linguistics is not studied as a discipline in isolation from other Institute courses; the prospective language teacher does not need to cover the entire discipline nor does he need to know the content and method of linguistic science, even at an elementary level, in any systematic way. The "coverage" of materials from the field of linguistic science is determined by a simple principle: their relevance to his future tasks as a teacher. Those facts, principles, and concepts should be taught which will help him perform his professional tasks better.

As a consequence of this approach to linguistic study, Institute programs have sought to relate the work in linguistics closely with the work in the methods course. One of the Questionnaire items explores this feature:

> WORK IN LINGUISTICS AND WORK IN THE METHODS COURSE ARE CLOSELY RELATED, AND WHAT IS DONE IN THE ONE CLASS REINFORCES WHAT IS DONE IN THE OTHER. (Item 38.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	67 %		34 %	
Home Campuses........		84 %		66 %

These responses indicate that the Institutes are - in the perception of their undergraduate participants - generally successful in their approach to the teaching of linguistic science and that the programs for prospective language teachers on the home campuses of the participants have not been able to find the means whereby this major goal can be successfully attained.

METHODOLOGY

The future language teacher needs to have - in addition to a practical command of the language, a knowledge of the foreign culture, and appropriate knowledge in both theoretical and applied linguistics - knowledge and skills in the field of education. It is imperative that he understand both the nature of learning in general and the psychology of language learning in particular. He must understand, for example, which language skills are to be developed, in what order, and how such skills can be acquired most efficiently. Two questionnaire items focussed on this point. One was:

> STUDENTS EXPLORE THE PRINCIPLES ON WHICH THE AUDIO-LINGUAL APPROACH IS BUILT. (Item 7.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	97 %		80 %	
Home Campuses........		70 %		43 %

The second asked about the construction and use of drills:

> STUDENTS CONSTRUCT AND CONDUCT AUDIO-LINGUAL DRILLS. (Item 6.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	85 %		52 %	
Home Campuses........		77 %		54 %

The percentage figures for these items show the same contrast between Institute programs and home campus programs which most of the previous tables in this report have reflected.

The future teacher must know about the instructional media appropriate to his level of instruction - textbooks, audio-visual materials, electro-mechanical aids. And he ought to know, too, the criteria that must be applied in judging the excellence of these instructional media. Several questionnaire items tried to probe these facets of instruction. The most important of these ran as follows:

> STUDENTS EXAMINE AND EVALUATE BOOKS, TAPES, AND OTHER MATERIALS DESIGNED FOR TEACHING THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE (Item 5.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes	92 %		62 %	
Home Campuses		79 %		48 %

The other items asked about very specific points:

a) Visual Aids:

THE PROGRAM INCLUDES BOTH DEMONSTRATIONS OF VISUAL AIDS AVAILABLE TO THE TEACHER OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND DISCUSSIONS OF THEIR POSSIBLE USES. (Item 20.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes	88 %		49 %	
Home Campuses		72 %		41 %

b) Programed Learning:

STUDENTS LEARN ABOUT PROGRAMED LEARNING IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE FIELD AND ABOUT SPECIFIC AUTO-INSTRUCTIONAL COURSES IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE. (Item 18.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes	57 %		24 %	
Home Campuses		75 %		54 %

The future teacher must know about evaluation of student learning. This includes knowledge of such items as the available testing instruments, principles of language test construction, criteria by which the excellence of a test can be judged, administering and scoring tests, and interpreting test scores. All of these facets were incorporated into one item on the Questionnaire:

STUDENTS LEARN ABOUT TESTS IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND HOW TO EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRESS. (Item 17.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	78 %		37 %	
Home Campuses........		68 %		39 %

Aside from actual practice teaching, several means were used at the Institutes that involved direct experience rather than reading about and discussing methodology. Two of these are the observation of demonstration classes and "practice" teaching with members of the peer group. The following table shows some additional contrasts between the Institutes and the home campus programs of Institute participants:

KEY: Column I shows percentages of Institute participants who found the practice valuable.

Column II shows percentages of participants who said the practice did not exist to any appreciable degree in home campus programs.

		COLUMN I	COLUMN II
a.	Observing a FLES demonstration class (Item 9.)..................................	63 %	77 %
b.	Observing a secondary demonstration class (Item 10.)................................	83 %	58 %
c.	Observing a demonstration class at intermediate or advanced level in proficiency (Item 11.)................................	56 %	67 %
d.	Practice teaching with members of peer group playing role of learners (Item 13.)	60 %	63 %

Another means used to help the methodology instruction in Institute programs is the Resources room. One item dealt with this feature:

> PROVISION IS MADE FOR A "RESOURCES ROOM" WHERE THERE ARE COPIES OF PROFESSIONAL PERIODICALS, SAMPLE TEXTBOOKS, AND OTHER READING MATERIALS IN AND ABOUT THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND ITS CULTURE. (Item 29.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	63 %		24 %	
Home Campuses........		71 %		47 %

The foreign language teacher who is responsible for intermediate and advanced classes, in both the elementary and secondary school, must be prepared to know how to deal with the foreign literature - what poems, stories, novels, plays, etc., to teach, and how to teach them. One Questionnaire item dealt with training along that line:

> THE TRAINING PROGRAM INCLUDES DISCUSSIONS ON THE ROLE OF THE FOREIGN LITERATURE IN CLASSES ON THE SECONDARY AND ELEMENTARY LEVEL. (Item 24.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	78 %		38 %	
Home Campuses........		72 %		46 %

The future foreign language teacher must be given a sense of his responsibilities as a professional and a good training program would therefore include means that will lead to that end. It would acquaint the prospective teacher with the periodicals and books in the field of foreign language teaching and would induce in him the habit of keeping up with new publications. It would acquaint him with societies and organizations in the field and create a desire on his part to engage in such activities as will give him a sense of participating in the community of foreign language teachers and scholars. This aspect of teacher education is difficult to reach through a Questionnaire item, but an attempt was made:

> STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN DISCUSSIONS OF PERIODICALS AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL ITEMS DESIGNED FOR TEACHERS OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE. THEY ALSO BECOME ACQUAINTED WITH TYPICAL ORGANIZATIONS TO WHICH TEACHERS OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE BELONG. (Item 22.)

	Positive	Negative	Highly Positive	Highly Negative
Institutes...........	75 %		33 %	
Home Campuses........		71 %		41 %

FREE COMMENTS BY RESPONDENTS

The Questionnaire instructions included an invitation to comment on any item in the list, or to make a general comment, on the reverse side of the answer sheet. Appendix C quotes a wide sampling of typical comments. Almost all of them are favorable; a few are critical.

The most humorously critical comment came from a student who claimed: "This summer ruined me." It turns out that the grades he received at the Institute, averaging 2.75, were considerably below his other grades - a 3.5 in the target language and a 4.0 in his other language courses. "Now how do I get into a decent graduate school or explain my drop in marks?" he pleads.

That student happens to have hit upon an important institute problem, since the likelihood is that the desire to maintain a high grade point average does not constitute adequate motivation for attaining the most important educational goals, i.e., the ones not easily objectified or quantified. (This writer strongly believes that those institutes which have not yet adopted the Pass-Fail grading system ought to consider doing so; but this is not a recommendation we feel appropriate to this report.)

Aside from that student's and a few others' complaints, the comments written on the reverse side of the answer sheets are generally favorable and often highly favorable. In reading through them, one notes the high frequency of such terms as "valuable," "tremendous," "great," "priceless," "invaluable," "best thing I have experienced during college," "fanatic convert to AIM," "magnificent," "superb," "ideal," "unforgettable," "wonderfully profitable," "very very beneficial," "immeasurably valuable," "the best thing that could have happened to me," "wonderful opportunity," "couldn't be duplicated by college," "most successful," "just GREAT," "high quality faculty," "a lasting and influential experience," "one of the greatest educational opportunities I've ever had," "spirit of the students and instructors was wonderful," "very enthusiastic," "unique opportunity," "astounding," "the next best thing to living in the foreign country," "one of the most valuable experiences I have ever had, or shall ever have."

Criticisms centered mainly on heavy class and homework load, work in linguistics that was excessively theoretical or work in the foreign culture that was excessively historical, and - in the case of language minors who were admitted - not enough emphasis on language skills. The comments showed that the institute program did not duplicate home campus programs; indeed, every piece of evidence points to the contrary condition. The following two comments express an attitude which we found widespread in our visits and which Questionnaire comments confirm:

> "My school has a program much superior to those programs of other schools in this field, but the Institute experience is far ahead."

> "I was exposed to things that I cannot find at my university."

For a few participants, the Institute experience led to a decision not to enter the teaching field below the college level. One student wrote: "I have decided because of this Institute not to teach on the secondary level. The ALM-Method is too boring - I couldn't stand to teach it five periods a day. (But I know it works best so far.) ... Maybe I'm just not cut out for secondary school teaching." Another wrote: "I no longer plan to go into secondary teaching. ... I am an intellectual and I do not belong in a high school."

But the majority view, by far, is expressed by the student who wrote: The institute's "greatest contribution to me was a demonstration of the interest and challenge in a career as FL teacher. ... Enthusiasm was created and new ideas about teaching possibilities. These are by no means available at my college. They have convinced me to really become an FL teacher."

SUMMARY

Part of the data used in our study of NDEA institutes for undergraduates preparing to become elementary or secondary teachers of modern foreign languages was collected by means of a questionnaire. It was sent to 1965 institute participants as well as to 1966 participants. Over 70% of the 1965 group and over 90% of the 1966 group returned their answer sheets to us. Their names or other identification did not appear. The instrument and response data are presented in the appendixes.

On the basis of certain criteria explained in Appendix D, the writer of this report interpreted certain responses "positive" and others as "negative." The means used at the institutes to attain the four major goals are analyzed under the following headings: practical command of the language, knowledge of the foreign culture, knowledge of linguistics, and methodology.

The data show that the institute programs were judged to be overwhelmingly successful in their attempt to discover appropriate means for attaining the major goals of teacher education in the foreign language field. However, for the most part, participants indicated by their responses that their home campuses were not able or not willing to use similar means in their education of prospective modern foreign language teachers. Indeed, if a reader can assume that the goals are generally the same in both types of program, the difference in means will appear to him unbelievably great.

The questionnaire lists forty activities or feature which are generally considered to be significant means in the education of foreign language teachers; most of them, according to participants' responses, were highly characteristic of their institute programs and were not highly characteristic of their home campus programs. In most cases the contrast, shown by the percentage figures, is startling.

The conclusions derived from the "objective" data in the Questionnaire responses are confirmed by the free comments which participants were invited to add if they wished.

Section III

ASSESSMENT

The visitors reported that the programs at all four of the 1966 institutes for undergraduates were high in quality. Individual reports did, however, note several points where improvement could take place. At one of the institutes, for example, our visitor noted that the type of civilization course offered there is precisely the kind available - indeed, typical - in many campus programs. It is the type of civilization course that deals with historical epochs and does little to help students explore the habits of thought and expression of members of the foreign culture or study value patterns which guide behavior in the foreign culture today. To those among the participants and faculty who needed external symbols of academic respectability, this course met all the criteria: homework assignments in a heavy tome that even the instructor admitted (in a confidential conversation with our visitor) he could not himself read with any enjoyment; lectures devoted to important historical personages; a lecture-hall arrangement stressing the physical and psychological distances separating the professor from the students; and so on. But in spite of its eminent respectability, the course appeared inappropriate in an institute program.

At another institute, our visitor found a fairly conventional grammar-composition course which, as he stated in his report, is questionable in any institute but particularly in one designed for undergraduates. The reason, our visitor went on to say, is that such a course is bound to duplicate the advanced grammar-composition course required in typical language major programs.

The principle involved here can be stated as follows: Since an institute program designed for undergraduates should concentrate on meeting those needs that typical college programs do not meet adequately, planners of curricula at such institutes should keep in mind the patterns of typical college programs for language majors and should avoid duplicating courses commonly required in such programs.

To illustrate this principle further: At some of the Code 1-2 institutes for in-service teachers, advanced literature courses have been included in the institute curriculum. Such a course may be appropriate in the retraining of in-service teachers. But, considering the emphasis of most undergraduate programs for language majors on literary study, an advanced literature course would probably not be justified as a required segment of the curriculum in an institute designed for undergraduates.

A second general observation by our visitors which pointed to a weakness - though, fortunately, not a serious weakness - in three of the four 1966 institutes designed for undergraduates dealt with the methods and demonstration classes and with the supporting work in the culture course and the linguistics course. These three institutes, in their original plans of operation, included the patterns for professional preparation that is prevalent in standard institutes, i.e., those designed for experienced teachers. Since the needs of undergraduates preparing for teaching are different, in many ways, from those of experienced teachers, a good deal of on-the-spot adaptation had to be made as the courses moved along. Such adaptations should, however, our visitor felt, have been anticipated and planned for in advance.

The principle involved here is also clear. The professional preparation segment of the institute curriculum - if a program for undergraduates is being designed - should be planned for inexperienced teachers. Hence the design of standard foreign language institute programs should not be followed without appropriate adaptations.

Surely one need not do more than mention this point, for the logic of the visitor's observation is obvious. The needs of the inexperienced teacher will be different from the needs of either the poor or the good experienced teacher. Not only are the kinds of knowledge needed somewhat different in the two cases; the psychological factors (the fears and anxieties, for example, when called upon to do a demonstration microlesson) are also different.

THE NEED FOR UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTES

Interviews with participants in the 1966 Institutes and the responses to the Questionnaire items by 1965 and 1966 participants show beyond any doubt that institutes for undergraduates are needed - and needed badly - in the modern foreign language field. It is clear that the training programs for language majors on the participants' home campuses are not doing an effective job in teacher education. They are not giving students the knowledge and abilities they will need in order to be excellent elementary or secondary school teachers.

The problem stems largely from the fact that undergraduate programs offered by the language departments of most colleges are designed to prepare the student for entrance into graduate school; they consist primarily of literary study. Whether or not programs so designed are successful for that particular end, it is clear that such programs are not likely to meet the needs of the prospective language teacher on the elementary and secondary level.

The MLA visitors did not expect to find the knowledge of participants at a high level in linguistics, culture, or professional preparation. But they expected, their individual reports make clear, a higher level of language skills than they encountered. At two of the four 1966 Institutes, the visitors judged that the oral work of two-thirds of the participants was below MLA standards for 'Good'; in the third Institute, it was judged to be no better, and possibly worse; and in the fourth, the figure was set at about 50%.

Responses to the Questionnaire items confirmed the visitors' impressions. One of the items asked about the large blocks of time each day devoted to practice in speaking the foreign language. Over 95% of the respondents replied that this Institute feature has been "highly valuable" to them, but over 40% said that such practice in speaking the foreign language did not exist "to any appreciable degree" in the foreign language program on their home campus. Moreover, 30% of the participants said that the foreign language major in their home campus program did not have practice in hearing the language to the extent deemed necessary for the development of adequate comprehension. It is characteristic of every modern language institute conducted under NDEA to provide remedial work for improving language skills; yet 55% of the participants indicated that no such provision existed on their home campus!

The analysis presented in Section II demonstrates that as one moves from language skills to other fields of knowledge that are indispensable to the prospective language teacher (knowledge of the foreign culture, linguistics, and methodology), the general situation appears about the same.

Such data, joined to the results of the visitors' observations and interviews, lead to one conclusion: the need for undergraduate modern language institutes will continue until college programs begin more accurately to reflect the new models of teacher education in modern foreign languages - models already emerging at the NDEA institutes and on a small but increasing number of college and university campuses.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of our observations and the data we have collected, we make the following recommendations:

1. NDEA institutes for undergraduates preparing to teach modern foreign language on the elementary or secondary level should be continued. Indeed, that segment of the NDEA institute program should be expanded.

2. Two major principles should guide the future planning of such institutes:

    a) The model developed by the modern foreign language profession for the "standard" institute - that is, the institute designed for in-service elementary or secondary teachers - should continue to supply the basic framework in planning institutes for undergraduates who are preparing to teach but have not yet had any teaching experience.

    b) The "standard" model should, however, be modified in two directions:

        1) Institute programs designed for undergraduates should concentrate on meeting those needs that typical college programs do not meet adequately. Hence planners of curricula at undergraduate institutes should keep in mind the patterns of typical college programs for language majors and should avoid duplicating courses commonly required in such programs.

        2) The segment of the Institute curriculum dealing with professional preparation - i.e., the methodology course, the demonstration classes, etc. - should be planned with the inexperienced teacher in mind. Hence that segment of the program in an institute for undergraduates should depart in certain ways from the professional preparation portion of the program in a "standard" institute, which has been designed, for the most part, with the experienced teacher in mind.

Appendix A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT

The following five pages are reproductions of the Questionnaire and Answer Sheet which were sent to participants in the 1965 and 1966 institutes for undergraduates.

The covering letter reads as follows:

> Please complete this questionnaire, after first carefully reading the Instructions, and return the answer sheet at your earliest convenience in the stamped envelope provided.
>
> Please note that you will retain your anonymity in this study; your name is not required on the answer sheet.
>
> Thank you for your cooperation.

A letter from Kenneth Mildenberger to the four 1966 institute directors asked them to be kind enough to distribute the "questionnaire packet" (which consisted of the Questionnaire, the covering letter, the answer sheet, and the return envelope) to each of the participants. Dr. Mildenberger's letter continues: "The introductory note and the Instructions make the purpose and answering procedure for the questionnaire clear, so no explaining need be done by you. You might, however, mention the importance of the study for the relatively new undergraduate Institute program." The Institute Directors must have taken the task seriously; we obtained responses from over 90% of the participants. Our response from the 1965 participants was also gratifying - over 70%. More than a dozen answer sheets, however, arrived too late to be counted.

The following appendixes deal with the Questionnaire responses and their interpretation. An analysis of these data is given in Section II of this report.

Bureau of the Budget No. 51-6619
Expiration Date: May 1, 1967

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Foreign Language Program
4 Washington Place . New York, N.Y. 10003 . Tel. (area 212) SPring 7-7100

SPECIAL SURVEY OF NDEA INSTITUTES FOR UNDERGRADUATES PREPARING TO BE TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Questionnaire for Undergraduate Institute Participants

INSTRUCTIONS

Before you read through these instructions, please glance through the list of items on the following pages. Notice that many of them describe activities in which you participated at the NDEA Institute for undergraduates which you attended.

We ask you to make two judgments about each item on the list.

FIRST, would you indicate the value to you of the particular Institute activity. The relevant question is: To what extent do you believe that the particular activity will have contributed to your future success as a language teacher? Under COLUMN I on the ANSWER SHEET, you will find the code letters H, M, L, and X.

Encircle H if you believe the Institute activity was HIGHLY VALUABLE to you.
M if you believe the Institute activity was MODERATELY VALUABLE to you.
L if you believe the Institute activity was of LITTLE VALUE to you.
X if the activity described was not practiced to any appreciable degree at your Institute.

SECOND, would you focus on your own campus this past year and consider the training program there for prospective language teachers like yourself. Under COLUMN II on the ANSWER SHEET, you will find code letters G, E, L, and X.

Encircle G if your own campus program required or encouraged the activity to a GREATER degree than the Institute which you attended.
E if the two programs required or encouraged the activity to about an EQUAL degree.
L if your own campus program required or encouraged the activity to a LESSER degree than the Institute you attended.
X if the activity described was not practiced to any appreciable degree in your own campus program.

* * * * * * * *

If you wish to comment on any item in the list or make a general comment, just use the reverse side of the ANSWER SHEET. We would be grateful for any comments you might make. (Indeed, if you need more space, use the reverse side of this Instruction Sheet.)

Notice that the ANSWER SHEET does not ask for your name. We want your responses to be anonymous. However, please indicate in the space provided the language which you studied at the Institute.

Please return to us only the ANSWER SHEET and any additional sheets carrying your comments.

Many thanks.

LIST OF ACTIVITIES

Please do not write your judgments on this sheet. Use the attached ANSWER SHEET.

(Note: The abbreviation FL stands for "foreign language" and the phrase the FL stands for the foreign language you studied at the Institute.)

- - - - - - - - - -

1. **Gave oral reports (five or more minutes in length) in the FL.**
2. **Did close reading of literary masterpieces from the foreign literature.**
3. **Spent a good deal of time in the language laboratory.**
4. **Had continuous practice in speaking the FL for large blocks of time each day.**
5. **Examined and evaluated books, tapes, and other materials designed for teaching the FL.**
6. **Constructed and conducted audio-lingual drills.**
7. **Explored the principles on which the audio-lingual approach is built.**
8. **Listened to native speaking guest lectures.**
9. **Observed a demonstration class consisting of elementary school children.**
10. **Observed a demonstration class for secondary school students.**
11. **Observed a demonstration class at intermediate (or advanced) level in proficiency.**
12. **Did practice teaching with elementary (or secondary) school children.**
13. **Did practice teaching with members of my peer group who played the role of language learners.**
14. **Had a good deal of instruction, with individual correction, in phonetics.**
15. **Attended plays, concerts, films, group singing sessions, etc., which were closely connected with the FL and the foreign culture.**

16. Had continuous practice hearing the FL for large blocks of time each day.

17. Learned about tests in the FL and how to evaluate student progress.

18. Learned about programed learning in the FL field and about specific auto-instructional courses in the FL.

19. Wrote essays and informal papers in the FL, with individual correction.

20. Saw demonstration of visual aids available to teachers of the FL and discussed their possible uses.

21. Continuous use of the FL appeared "natural" -- in fact, the expected thing.

22. Participated in discussions of periodicals and other professional items designed for teachers of the FL; also discussed typical organizations to which teachers of the FL belong.

23. Explored the habits of thought and expression of members of the foreign culture, tried to understand how they typically see life and the world.

24. Participated in discussions on the role of the foreign literature in FL classes below the college level.

25. Those who needed it participated in "remedial" sessions for improving language skills.

26. Those who were ready for it participated in sessions doing "advanced" work.

27. Used the language laboratory during evening and weekend hours.

28. Native-speaking faculty or instructional assistants sat with us as we conversed in the FL during meal-times.

29. Used the resources room where there were copies of professional periodicals, sample textbooks, and other reading materials in and about the FL and its culture.

30. Took advantage of off-campus opportunities for gaining knowledge about the foreign culture.

31. Took part in a play, musical, or some other type of performance (e.g., poetry reading) requiring the use of the FL.

32. Program appeared "coordinated" as there was strong interrelationship between one course and another.

33. Studied about masterpieces of art, music, history, philosophy, and science in the foreign culture.

34. Studied about contemporary social institutions and the value patterns which guide daily behavior in the foreign culture.

35. Use of English by both staff and students was reduced to a minimum in the classroom (and, to a certain extent, outside the classroom as well).

36. Students in the program were placed in small sections according to their proficiency in the FL.

37. Lectures given in the FL were taped so students could listen to them again in the laboratory.

38. Work in linguistics and work in the methods course were closely related and what was done in the one class reinforced what was done in the other.

39. Became familiar with contrasts in the structures and sounds of English and the FL.

40. Discussed different theoretical approaches to grammar (e.g., traditional, structural, transformational) exploring the strengths peculiar to each.

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION INSTITUTE QUESTIONNAIRE

ANSWER SHEET

Encircle the language you studied at your Institute: French German Spanish

---

RESUME OF INSTRUCTIONS (Please see Instructions for fuller statement):

COLUMN I responses focus on your Institute program. For each item, encircle

H if you believe the activity was HIGHLY VALUABLE to you.
M if you believe the activity was MODERATELY VALUABLE to you.
L if you believe the activity was of LITTLE VALUE to you.
X if the activity described was not practiced to any appreciable degree at your Institute.

COLUMN II responses focus on the program for prospective language teachers on your own campus. For each item, encircle

G if your own campus program required or encouraged the activity to a GREATER degree than the program at the Institute you attended.
E if the two programs required or encouraged the activity to about an EQUAL degree.
L if your own campus program required or encouraged the activity to a LESSER degree.
X if the activity described was not practiced to any appreciable degree in your own campus program.

PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE LETTER UNDER COLUMN I AND ONE LETTER UNDER COLUMN II FOR EACH ITEM.

	COLUMN I	COLUMN II
1.	H M L X	G E L X
2.	H M L X	G E L X
3.	H M L X	G E L X
4.	H M L X	G E L X
5.	H M L X	G E L X
6.	H M L X	G E L X
7.	H M L X	G E L X
8.	H M L X	G E L X
9.	H M L X	G E L X
10.	H M L X	G E L X
11.	H M L X	G E L X
12.	H M L X	G E L X
13.	H M L X	G E L X
14.	H M L X	G E L X
15.	H M L X	G E L X
16.	H M L X	G E L X
17.	H M L X	G E L X
18.	H M L X	G E L X
19.	H M L X	G E L X
20.	H M L X	G E L X
21.	H M L X	G E L X
22.	H M L X	G E L X
23.	H M L X	G E L X
24.	H M L X	G E L X
25.	H M L X	G E L X
26.	H M L X	G E L X
27.	H M L X	G E L X
28.	H M L X	G E L X
29.	H M L X	G E L X
30.	H M L X	G E L X
31.	H M L X	G E L X
32.	H M L X	G E L X
33.	H M L X	G E L X
34.	H M L X	G E L X
35.	H M L X	G E L X
36.	H M L X	G E L X
37.	H M L X	G E L X
38.	H M L X	G E L X
39.	H M L X	G E L X
40.	H M L X	G E L X

Appendix B

THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE DATA

1965 (N = 81) and 1966 (N = 146) Total N = 227

INSTITUTES

H - Highly valuable
M - Moderately valuable
L - Little value
X - Not practiced to any appreciable degree at the Institute
NA - Not answered

HOME CAMPUSES

G - Greater degree
E - Equal degree
L - Lesser degree
X - Not practiced to any appreciable degree at home campus
NA - Not answered

1. Gave oral reports (five or more minutes in length in the FL.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	33	16	7	25	0	17	22	20	21	1
1966	50	24	6	63	3	41	26	36	37	6
Total	83	40	13	88	3	58	48	56	58	7
%	36.6	17.6	5.7	38.8	1.3	25.5	21.1	24.7	25.5	3.1

2. Did close reading of literary masterpieces from the foreign literature.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	14	10	6	51	0	62	12	1	5	1
1966	83	42	10	11	0	62	47	27	8	2
Total	97	62	16	62	0	124	59	28	13	3
%	42.7	22.9	7.0	27.3	0	54.6	26.0	12.3	5.7	6.3

3. Spent a good deal of time in the language laboratory.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	27	29	18	7	0	6	26	29	19	1
1966	41	69	24	12	0	16	30	66	31	3
Total	68	98	42	19	0	22	56	95	50	4
%	30.0	43.2	18.5	8.4	0	9.7	24.7	41.8	22.0	1.8

4. Had continuous practice in speaking the FL for large blocks of time each day.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	78	3	0	0	0	0	7	38	35	1
1966	138	5	1	2	0	1	5	81	58	1
Total	216	8	1	2	0	1	12	119	93	2
%	95.1	3.6	0.4	0.9	0	0.4	5.3	52.4	41.0	0.9

5. Examined and evaluated books, tapes, and other materials designed for teaching the FL.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	44	29	5	3	0	2	15	26	37	1
1966	96	40	7	3	0	5	18	44	71	8
Total	140	69	12	6	0	7	33	70	108	9
%	61.7	30.4	5.3	2.6	0	3.1	14.5	30.8	47.6	4.0

6. Constructed and conducted audio-lingual drills.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	34	27	6	14	0	7	10	21	42	1
1966	85	48	4	7	2	3	19	32	81	11
Total	119	75	10	21	2	10	29	53	123	12
%	52.4	33.0	4.4	9.3	0.9	4.4	12.8	23.3	54.2	5.3

7. Explored the principles on which the audio-lingual approach is built.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	60	17	3	1	0	2	23	21	34	1
1966	122	22	2	0	0	3	30	41	63	9
Total	182	39	5	1	0	5	53	62	97	10
%	80.2	17.2	2.2	0.4	0	2.2	23.3	27.3	42.7	4.4

8. Listened to native speaking guest lecturers.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	41	29	5	6	0	2	10	27	41	1
1966	86	33	15	12	0	6	36	54	46	4
Total	127	62	20	18	0	8	46	81	87	5
%	55.9	27.3	8.8	7.9	0	3.6	20.3	35.7	38.3	2.2

9. Observed a demonstration class consisting of elementary school children.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	43	14	2	22	0	2	3	8	67	1
1966	63	22	6	54	1	5	13	14	108	6
Total	106	36	8	76	1	7	16	22	175	7
%	46.7	15.8	3.6	33.4	0.4	3.1	7.0	9.7	77.1	3.1

10. Observed a demonstration class for secondary school students.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	64	15	1	1	0	11	13	13	43	1
1966	93	15	4	32	2	16	17	18	88	7
Total	157	30	5	33	2	27	30	31	131	8
%	69.2	13.2	2.2	14.5	0.9	11.9	13.2	13.6	57.7	3.6

11. Observed a demonstration class at intermediate (or advanced) level in proficiency.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	48	13	2	18	0	5	10	12	53	1
1966	55	12	3	74	2	16	11	11	100	8
Total	103	25	5	92	2	21	21	23	153	9
%	45.4	11.0	2.2	40.5	0.9	9.3	9.3	10.1	67.4	4.0

12. Did practice teaching with elementary (or secondary) school children.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	32	17	8	24	0	42	10	2	26	1
1966	77	34	11	24	0	29	19	12	80	6
Total	109	51	19	48	0	71	29	14	106	7
%	48.0	22.5	8.4	21.1	0	31.3	12.8	6.2	46.7	3.1

13. Did practice teaching with members of my peer group who played the role of language learners.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	22	13	21	25	0	7	8	11	54	1
1966	63	41	7	34	1	9	18	25	89	5
Total	85	54	28	59	1	16	26	36	143	6
%	37.4	23.8	12.3	26.0	0.4	7.0	11.4	15.8	63.0	2.6

14. Had a good deal of instruction, with individual correction, in phonetics.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	59	15	5	2	0	3	19	28	29	2
1966	70	45	17	13	1	15	28	53	45	5
Total	129	60	22	15	1	18	47	81	74	7
%	56.8	26.4	9.7	6.6	0.4	7.9	20.7	35.7	32.6	3.1

15. Attended plays, concerts, films, group singing sessions, etc., which were closely connected with the FL and the foreign culture.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	53	21	5	1	1	2	14	38	25	2
1966	97	38	9	2	0	9	27	71	36	3
Total	150	59	14	3	1	11	41	109	61	5
%	66.1	26.0	6.2	1.3	0.4	4.8	18.1	48.0	26.9	2.2

16. Had continuous practice hearing the FL for large blocks of time each day.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	78	3	0	0	0	0	8	43	29	2
1966	142	4	0	0	0	1	12	93	38	1
Total	220	7	0	0	0	1	20	136	67	3
%	96.9	3.1	0	0	0	0.4	8.8	60.0	29.5	1.3

17. Learned about tests in the FL and how to evaluate student progress.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	24	28	17	12	0	11	14	28	27	1
1966	60	64	14	8	0	6	33	38	61	8
Total	84	92	31	20	0	17	47	66	88	9
%	37.0	40.5	13.6	8.8	0	7.5	20.7	29.1	38.8	4.0

18. Learned about programed learning in the FL field and about specific auto-instructional courses in the FL.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	24	27	21	8	1	4	12	19	45	1
1966	30	49	35	31	1	8	22	28	77	11
Total	54	76	56	39	2	12	34	47	122	12
%	23.8	33.4	24.7	17.2	0.9	5.3	15.0	20.7	53.8	5.3

19. Wrote essays and informal papers in the FL, with individual correction.

	H	N	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	56	18	5	2	0	16	26	33	5	1
1966	100	37	6	3	0	27	59	44	13	3
Total	156	55	11	5	0	43	85	77	18	4
%	68.7	24.2	4.8	2.2	0	18.9	37.4	33.9	7.9	1.8

20. Saw demonstration of visual aids available to teachers of the FL and discussed their possible uses.

	H	N	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	44	26	10	1	0	3	22	27	28	1
1966	67	63	9	7	0	6	24	44	64	8
Total	111	89	19	8	0	9	46	71	92	9
%	49.0	39.2	8.4	3.6	0	4.0	20.3	31.3	40.5	4.0

21. Continuous use of the FL appeared "natural" - in fact, the expected thing.

	H	N	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	74	3	2	1	1	1	12	32	35	1
1966	124	19	1	1	1	1	11	66	64	4
Total	198	22	3	2	2	2	23	98	99	5
%	87.2	9.7	1.3	0.9	0.9	0.9	10.1	43.2	43.6	2.2

22. Participated in discussions of periodicals and other professional items designed for teachers of the FL; also discussed typical organizations to which teachers of the FL belong.

	H	N	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	29	33	14	5	0	2	24	24	30	1
1966	46	62	27	11	0	6	27	43	63	7
Total	75	95	41	16	0	8	51	67	93	8
%	33.0	41.8	18.1	7.0	0	3.6	22.4	29.5	41.0	3.6

23. Explored the habits of thought and expression of members of the foreign culture; tried to understand how they typically see life and the world.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	53	16	6	6	0	11	28	26	14	2
1966	100	29	8	9	0	4	40	63	34	5
Total	153	45	14	15	0	15	68	89	48	7
%	67.4	19.8	6.2	6.6	0	6.6	30.0	39.2	21.1	3.1

24. Participated in discussions on the role of the foreign literature in FL classes below the college level.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	20	37	10	13	1	7	12	27	33	2
1966	66	53	17	10	0	3	29	33	72	9
Total	86	90	27	23	1	10	41	60	105	11
%	37.9	39.6	11.9	10.1	0.4	4.4	18.1	26.4	46.3	4.8

25. Those who needed it participated in "remedial" sessions for improving language skills.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	34	20	13	13	1	2	15	17	45	2
1966	47	28	21	47	3	8	24	27	82	5
Total	81	48	34	60	4	10	39	44	127	7
%	35.7	21.1	15.0	26.4	1.8	4.4	17.2	19.4	55.9	3.1

26. Those who were ready for it participated in sessions doing "advanced" work.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	32	17	11	20	1	11	13	18	36	3
1966	44	35	12	47	8	16	34	26	62	8
Total	76	52	23	67	9	27	47	44	98	11
%	33.4	22.9	10.1	29.6	4.0	11.9	20.7	19.4	43.2	4.8

27. Used the language laboratory during evening and weekend hours.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	4	13	17	47	0	14	11	7	48	1
1966	20	26	26	74	0	28	20	26	67	5
Total	24	39	43	121	0	42	31	33	115	6
%	10.6	17.2	18.9	53.3	0	18.5	13.6	14.5	50.7	2.6

28. Native-speaking faculty or instructional assistants sat with us as we conversed in the FL during meal-times.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	64	11	4	1	1	0	6	18	56	1
1966	130	16	0	0	0	0	4	36	102	4
Total	194	27	4	1	1	0	10	54	158	5
%	85.4	11.9	1.8	0.4	0.4	0	4.4	23.8	69.6	2.2

29. Used the resources room where there were copies of professional periodicals, sample textbooks, and other reading materials in and about the FL and its culture.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	8	25	26	22	0	15	17	16	32	1
1966	47	63	21	15	0	4	26	38	74	4
Total	55	88	47	37	0	19	43	54	106	5
%	24.2	38.8	20.7	16.3	0	8.4	18.9	23.8	46.7	2.2

30. Took advantage of off-campus opportunities for gaining knowledge about the FL and its culture.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	20	18	7	36	0	20	8	19	33	1
1966	36	29	14	67	0	32	21	33	56	4
Total	56	47	21	103	0	52	29	52	89	5
%	24.7	20.7	9.3	45.4	0	22.9	12.8	22.9	39.2	2.2

31. Took part in a play, musical, or some other type of performance (e.g., poetry reading) requiring the use of the FL.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	24	13	16	28	0	13	10	12	45	1
1966	48	21	16	61	0	27	19	33	63	4
Total	72	34	32	89	0	40	29	45	108	5
%	31.7	15.0	14.1	39.2	0	17.6	12.8	19.8	47.6	2.2

32. Program appeared "coordinated" as there was strong interrelationship between one course and another.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	44	29	4	4	0	4	20	33	23	1
1966	90	32	16	8	0	10	31	62	39	4
Total	134	61	20	12	0	14	51	95	62	5
%	59.0	26.9	8.8	5.3	0	6.2	22.5	41.8	27.3	2.2

33. Studied about masterpieces of art, music, history, philosophy, and science in the foreign culture.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	19	21	11	30	0	38	18	9	14	2
1966	48	53	19	26	0	43	45	39	17	3
Total	67	74	30	56	0	81	63	47	31	5
%	29.5	32.6	13.2	24.7	0	35.7	27.8	20.7	13.6	2.2

34. Studied about contemporary social institutions and the value patterns which guide daily behavior in the foreign culture.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	39	20	2	20	0	16	16	26	22	1
1966	76	41	13	16	0	12	39	55	37	3
Total	115	61	15	36	0	28	55	81	59	4
%	50.7	26.9	6.6	15.8	0	12.3	24.2	35.7	26.0	1.8

35. Use of English by both staff and students was reduced to a minimum in the classroom (and, to a certain extent, outside the classroom as well).

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	77	3	0	1	0	2	15	41	20	3
1966	132	11	2	0	1	2	33	78	29	4
Total	209	14	2	1	1	4	48	119	49	7
%	92.1	6.2	0.9	0.4	0.4	1.8	21.1	52.4	21.6	3.1

36. Students in the program were placed in small sections according to their proficiency in the FL.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	63	13	3	2	0	0	9	25	46	1
1966	108	23	9	4	2	2	14	45	80	5
Total	171	36	12	6	2	2	23	70	126	6
%	75.3	15.8	5.3	2.6	0.9	0.9	10.1	30.8	55.5	2.6

37. Lectures given in the FL were taped so students could listen to them again in the laboratory.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	8	11	17	45	0	3	3	6	67	2
1966	49	30	29	37	1	5	6	12	119	4
Total	57	41	46	82	1	8	9	18	186	6
%	25.1	18.1	20.3	36.1	0.4	3.6	4.0	8.3	81.9	2.6

38. Work in linguistics and work in the methods course were closely related and what was done in the one class reinforced what was done in the other.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	23	23	14	20	1	5	9	17	48	2
1966	55	53	18	19	1	6	10	23	101	6
Total	78	76	32	39	2	11	19	40	149	8
%	34.4	33.4	14.1	17.2	0.9	4.8	8.3	17.6	65.6	3.6

39. Became familiar with contrasts in the structures and sounds of English and the FL.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	69	8	4	0	0	2	17	33	28	1
1966	113	24	7	2	0	8	31	53	50	4
Total	182	32	11	2	0	10	48	86	78	5
%	80.2	14.1	4.8	0.9	0	4.4	21.1	37.9	34.4	2.2

40. Discussed different theoretical approaches to grammar (e.g., traditional, structural, transformational) exploring the strengths peculiar to each.

	H	M	L	X	NA	G	E	L	X	NA
1965	29	29	11	12	0	8	19	20	33	1
1966	78	46	15	7	0	8	29	40	60	9
Total	107	75	26	19	0	16	48	60	93	10
%	47.1	33.0	11.4	8.4	0	7.0	21.1	26.4	41.0	4.4

Appendix C

A SAMPLING OF THE FREE COMMENTS WRITTEN ON THE ANSWER SHEETS

RESPONDENTS WERE INVITED TO ADD ANY COMMENTS THEY WISHED. THE FOLLOWING REPRESENTS A WIDE SAMPLING OF THESE FREE COMMENTS.

NOTE: Wherever a specific language was named, we have substituted the phrase "the FL," standing for "the foreign language" taught at the Institute.

My experience at the Institute for undergraduates, is, perhaps, the most valuable one I have had, as far as my professional training is concerned.

Before my Institute experience I felt wholly inadequate to teach the language. My improvement in language and teaching skills was tremendous and, as a result, my student teaching was a very fruitful time of work. My supervisor observed that my advantage of having participated in an Institute started me at a position far ahead of the other student teachers. While they were having problems with pronunciation, speaking, materials, etc., I was able to do extra things for my class and have a great time teaching.

Looking back on the four years I spent in college the one high point which was of most value was the NDEA Institute I attended.

The NDEA Institute was definitely the most valuable experience I have had during my study of Foreign Laguage.

The language program in my university is very minimal and I consider the Institute experience priceless.

The entire program of the Institute in general was invaluable to me. As a FL teacher this year, I feel better qualified to teach. Without the Institute, I would have felt that I would cripple the students. My personal interest in the FL has heightened since I attended the Institute.

I am not really sure if my answers to the questionnaire reflect how I feel about the Institute. I feel very strongly that the Institute was, by far, the best thing I have experienced during college!!

I would hate to think of being a language teacher without having been to the NDEA Institute.

Q. 4, 16, 21, 28, 35 - "large blocks of time each day" is a magnificent understatement. The morale of my Institute was tremendous, use of the FL constant, even in small groups off campus. Aside from the AIM methods course, constant use of the language was the most valuable part of my entire summer.

Study of literature (Q. 2) as well as of "art, music, history, philosophy, and science" (Q. 33) was unfortunately minimal. As for Q. 23 and 34 - likewise an unfortunate gap.

The summer was exceedingly pleasant - but intellectually not very taxing. Were we intentionally given 7-8 hours of classes a day so that "homework" would be unnecessary or minimal?

Above all, thank you for making me a fanatic convert to AIM.

The most notable difference in the training program for language teachers in the NDEA Institute and that of my own campus lies in the exploration of the principles on which the audio-lingual approach is built, in the construction and conduct of the audio-lingual drills, and in the use of the foreign language itself at all times. This amounts to the fact that my own campus program is not adequately preparing future teachers in the realm of understanding the foundation and bases of the audio-lingual approach to teaching a foreign language.

In the Institute, I feel that our teachers more than adequately built our understanding of the audio-lingual approach, for they erased any doubt and skepticism of this approach which is so often found in our secondary schools today.

The value of this program wasn't really realized until later on during the year when the shock and the exhaustion wore off. My ear was much better trained, and I was much more fluent in the language. Being forced to speak the FL increased my courage and proficiency greatly.

My main disagreement with the NDEA Institute was a problem which was almost unavoidable: Lack of time and subsequent overaccelerated program. Hearing and speaking the FL all day and night plus homework was valuable but very tiring. With a little more time for a few things to be absorbed well, we might have retained more than we did.

Those of us who have worked hard in college all year and then have to face an intensified session such as the NDEA Institute are at a disadvantage. If it were possible to lessen the work load somehow, the program could possibly be more effective.

The Institute was really magnificent. The most important thing about it was that we spoke the FL throughout the seven weeks we were there; this increased my language competency considerably, and I even got to the point where I was able to think in the target language. Each of the courses we had was of great value to me, and I can truthfully say that I used something from each one of them in my own student teaching. The practice of holding NDEA Institutes for undergraduates is of great value and does, I think, strongly serve the cause of better foreign language teaching.

I have since attended an overseas institute and this experience has undoubtedly changed my opinion of the earlier institute in some ways. Some specific comments in this regard:

1. After having had two additional methods courses, I would say our Institute Methods Professor was superb!
2. A course in civilization and culture for prospective teachers should concentrate on the modern era, not the middle ages, as did ours.

My experience in the Institute made me a much better student teacher, I'm sure. I was able to by-pass all the basic instructions and try many new methods, such as programed learning.

The greatest advantage of my undergraduate Institute was that the foreign language was spoken 100% of the time, both in and outside of the classrooms. This was an invaluable experience. Much to my great disappointment, however, in the Overseas Institute I attended, the Linguistics and Methods courses were conducted in English (perhaps because our American instructors felt inadequate in explaining their material in the language). These Institutes, I believe, should without exception be conducted completely in the FL; otherwise their purpose is being partially defeated.

The other main advantages of the undergraduate Institute were the breaking the group up into smaller groups according to ability and then working intensively at speaking and writing the foreign language. The language lab was always available for use by people with particular problems in pronunciation; but this was on a voluntary basis, and the exhausting schedule left students too weary to take advantage of this opportunity.

My only criticism of the Institute was the too intensive schedule we had to follow. Even the most avid learner becomes discouraged when he attends classes and evening lectures eight hours a day and is expected to do an hour or more of preparing for each of these classes.

I found the quality of instruction superb, the native-speaker system ideal. The Institute was excellently directed. Unforgettable, very valuable experience.

My college institution offered no courses in methods and linguistics. It studied mostly the foreign literature. Also, our language classes were very small and homogeneous. Therefore, we were not separated into groups.

The methods course offered at the NDEA Institute I attended was most valuable - as was also the learning and "feeling" of the foreign mentality, culture, etc.

Not all our classes at the Institute were conducted in the FL and I found this detrimental to establishing a foreign atmosphere.

Altogether, the Institute was a wonderfully profitable experience that I think should be encouraged and continued.

A very close rapport between student and teacher is very very beneficial - and the "extra" activities, plays, music, trips, etc., are highly valuable. These "non-scholastic" activities were what gave the foreign taste - and this is what we students can never bring to our classrooms.

The fact that any use of English among members of the Institute was strongly discouraged was one of the most valuable aspects of the program. It became necessary to think in the language; indeed, at the end of the Institute we considered ourselves a group of *French people* rather than French students.

I should like to take this opportunity to say that attending the NDEA Institute was *immeasurably valuable* to me. I learned many methods and acquired a *number of ideas which* I shall incorporate in my classes when I begin teaching this fall.

Thank you for allowing me to express my opinion. All in all, I feel that the Institute was the best thing that could have happened to me.

Probably far more valuable to me than any of the individual subject areas was the experience of being placed in an almost entirely foreign situation. In the Institute we were not merely studying the language and the culture - we were living it - and even just that experience alone would have made the Institute worthwhile. I am truly indebted to the NDEA for having had such a wonderful opportunity.

The Institute training was invaluable to me especially since I attended a liberal arts college and needed "supplementing."

It was a highly valuable experience which couldn't be duplicated by a college program.

Foreign language study in my own campus has slipped to a degree to mediocrity on my campus for a number of reasons:

1. Personality clashes among teachers and chairman.
2. Idea clashes.
3. Age element of teachers concerned.

A change for the better is definitely in sight due to changes that have occurred since January, 1966.

The coordination-dialogue that should exist between the Teacher Training Department and the other various majors is very seriously lacking on campus.

The NDEA Institute was highly valuable to my future career. Although some of the activities were similar to my college preparation, the ability to do everything "foreign-style" for eight weeks was most helpful and encouraging. It was, for me, without a doubt, a most successful summer spent in the Institute.

What was most valuable:

1. FL spoken not only in class but constantly out of class to the extent that it was a nature language to us.
2. Conversation classes each day on a different, interesting subject. (Oftentimes one part of the class would argue pro on a

subject; another part, con. One member of the class would often give a five minute introduction to start the discussion.

3. Oral speeches in front of class.
4. Native-speaking teachers eating with us. High quality of our teachers most notable.

What would have been valuable but not practiced to great extent:

1. Practice teaching on peers.
2. Culture class with more depth.
3. Methods class more closely related to actual teaching experience.

Column II is really of little value to me in my case because my campus is the campus which sponsored the Institute. If I had not attended the Institute I would have had exactly the same teachers and courses during this past year. However, just being able to observe these two men's classes was probably the most inspiring part of the Institute.

I felt that the Institute was excellent and especially liked the linguistics, conversation, and composition. I found little value in the culture and in the methods but it could well be because I had already touched upon these areas in my own college. Much of the material given to us in the Institute was very valuable to me when I did my student teaching.

The teachers were just GREAT. We had only to call and they were there to help. We even had brush-up sessions before any linguistics exam. The Institute was of great value to me!

We had the opportunity to watch two excellent teachers conduct FL instruction on four levels - pre-first graders, 4th graders, 7th graders and 9th graders. Very valuable.

At the Institute we were divided into four groups according to our speaking and writing abilities. Group A (top group into which I advanced from B) did more "advanced" work than the others.

The small group sessions were especially valuable. Besides the class hours, several of the staff members were available for discussion. Never before had I had the opportunity to practice the FL to such a degree.

In my college there was no specific course for teachers of foreign languages. For this reason the Methods course at the Institute was very helpful. Another valuable aspect was that we spoke the FL among ourselves all the time. It is very difficult to encourage this sort of experience in an undergraduate situation, so this was perhaps the most valuable part of the Institute for me personally.

My university was as efficient as the Institute in conducting classes entirely in the FL; however, they were handicapped by the fact that students are available for exposure to the foreign language for only an hour a day, and thus, cannot expect results equal to an Institute where language dosage is concentrated.

Observation of FLES was a "must" at the Institute. It is always available on my campus at the lab school, but students seldom take advantage of observing classes there.

I myself feel that most of my progress was in listening comprehension - many of the lectures at first seemed to be too rapid for me to follow, but with the many opportunities to hear the FL, this soon disappeared.

In my session I felt there were too many demonstration classes - after two or three sessions the methods were much the same and nothing much could be learned.

I felt the students themselves, were lax as far as the continous use of the FL (I myself included).

There was not enough time to listen to all of the taped lectures that we were required to listen to and take notes on and still keep up with the required work in other courses. On the whole, the Institute tried to crowd too much work (classes, homework, and extracurricular activities) into each twenty-four-hour period. As a result, one had to choose which activity to do well and which to do sloppily or even to omit. If a student tried to do all work conscientiously, he would have easily become ill from overexhaustion.

In Column I when I stated that a certain activity was of moderate or lesser value to me, it was due to the fact that this activity was lacking in quality or depth, not because it was an activity of no use to me as a teacher.

These types of programs are very useful for prospective teachers of foreign languages; however, there is room for much improvement. Courses could be more coordinated, especially linguistics and methods. I think class hours should be shortened because the students do not have much of an opportunity to practice speaking the foreign language outside the classroom and language tables. If students have only about four hours after evening meal, in those four hours he has to prepare for the following day's classes. This amount of work does not give students ample opportunity to converse in foreign language with other students and native assistants and it leaves the student too exhausted to participate actively and be alert the following day.

I hope that these programs continue. Indeed I hope they will be increased in number and that they will be improved.

Participants of my Institute taught both the demonstration class and their peer group. I did not because there was not sufficient time for scheduling all of the participants. However, observing the student teachers was a highly valuableexperience for me.

My school does not offer a major in this language and therefore offers no methods course, which accounts for the decided contrast among many of my answers.

The Institute did not concentrate on the language, itself. Too much time was placed on literature, civilization, linguistics. We didn't have sufficient time for general drills and intensive grammar and pronunciation drills. We spent less than a half hour each day in the lab which I felt was insufficient. There were far too many levels of achievement within the Institute with the result that very few people felt adequately placed.

The native assistants were excellent. They assisted with assignments and were available almost all the time for informal chats in the foreign language.

The idea of an undergraduate language institute is excellent; however, I think it could be improved by more careful planning. For example, why not spare people who are not language majors but still interested in teaching the language the untold fustration and discouragement by providing more special classes for them? What good does it do for a person to attend classes day after day and hardly be able to understand? The same class could be offered to this group with modifications according to their level. In this way the student could improve his listening comprehension and also appreciate the content of the lecture, without resorting to copying someone else's notes. In addition, every one in the Institute should be told explicitly that he will be marked according to his level and effort, rather than letting him worry until the end of the Institute.

This experience was quite rewarding, but could have been more so if there hadn't been so many unnecessary frustrations. It is very important, in my opinion, to include people who have a minor in the language, because versatility is needed.

In my estimation this undergraduate Institute in the foreign language was indeed very beneficial with respect to professional preparation and with respect to language preparation. Although I feel that there should be some modifications in the program such as a shorter class day, thus allowing the student more time for study work, generally speaking, the program was successful and it represented a great effort on the part of all concerned, specifically staff, director and students.

Unfortunately there was little division according to language skills in our NDEA program except in grammar classes. But all of the students who came to the program with enough grammar to be in the highest group received the highest grades and other students (no matter how much progress was demonstrated) received lower grades. This is a bit unfair when many of these lower students studied more and were in fact excellent students.

Let me make one example. My cumulative average is 3.2 (4 pt. system). I had previously taken 12 hours in this FL, had a 3.5 in these courses, a 4 average in my other language courses. I come to this Institute, am a lesser qualified student, try hard, study very much, and receive 3 B's and a C. (Compared to my cumulative average this is a 2.75 average). Now how do I get into a decent graduate school or explain my drop in marks? I want to study this FL in grad school. So this summer ruined me.

The Institute as a whole has been extremely valuable to me. My command of the language and ease in it improved tremendously. The methodology is especially valuable, as are also linguistics and civilization. The courses I have already had in methods and in civilization at my school cannot begin to compare with the courses here in these subjects, nor would I be able to find such a thorough course in applied linguistics. There seemed to be a bit too much outside work required when we had classes all day, but all in all it was a valuable experience.

The Institute is a very worthwhile program for undergraduates planning to teach. The constant exposure to the FL, the introduction of the newest methods, and the personal interest that is given each participant in order that he may improve his FL proficiency is really a great help and a lasting and influential experience.

The Institute was a success. I learned how I can be a good language teacher even though I don't have a full command of the language.

I would like to take the opportunity to say that the NDEA Summer Language Institute has been one of the greatest educational opportunities I've ever had. Without the Methods course I would have been completely lost before I even began my student teaching. As a prospective teacher I feel that all foreign language majors who are planning to teach should have this same opportunity that I have had. Indeed, I am very grateful.

Excellent program. Instruction consistently at a high level. Gives students a basis for future proficiency and self-confidence in the classroom.

On the whole I found the Institute to be a wonderful idea and a great help to my future work as a teacher. What I found to be the most useful were the classes pertaining to the methods of teaching FL, the observations, the Methods class itself and the practice we got teaching one another and the high school classes. It is my opinion that this could have been better organized so that each student got to teach the class, prepare a lesson plan, and make up and give an exam.

The Institute was a valuable experience for me. I learned much that could help me as a teacher. The two best things about the Institute program were the continual immersion in the FL and the methods course. The other subjects like history and linguistics are offered at my university and I have already had them (a more thorough treatment, too). I think that some improvement could be made to avoid such duplication.

My proficiency in the spoken language has been improved the most through the daily use of the language. The atmosphere and the spirit of the students and instructors was wonderful. We enjoyed the six weeks together and learned at the same time.

I found the methods course and the continuous use of the FL very useful because it enabled me to achieve a better command of the spoken language as well as a better understanding of the most up-to-date teaching methods. Here, I have learned more in seven weeks than I could learn in two semesters on my own campus.

I feel that this Institute has helped me a great deal, not only from the standpoint of my knowledge of German but also from the standpoint of professional preparation. However, I am disappointed in that I was really only shown one method of instruction - the Audio-lingual Method. In addition, I had hoped to learn more of history and linguistics than I did. But I would never have attempted to teach the FL before attending this Institute, whereas I now feel competent in teaching.

I consider the institute to be of great benefit to me in respect to practicing speaking the language and developing a better pronunciation. Certain factors relating to scheduling of classes and use of the language lab could have been given more emphasis.

The content of this Institute has been superb, wonderful for me since I had had little or no contact with such thing at home.

I certainly appreciated the opportunity of attending this Institute for undergraduates. Not only was much knowledge skillfully taught but everyone involved seemed to be trying to create a positive atmosphere and condition for learning.

My personal belief is that a FL institute is of greater value to the undergraduate student than the experienced teacher. It seems more reasonable to teach FL methods to prospective teachers than to those individuals who have adapted themselves to a certain mode of teaching and may be hardened to more up-to-date methods. However, I think that the best possible student for an FL Institute is one who has just graduated (received his A.B.) and is about to enter the FL teaching profession the following autumn.

I found the Institute entirely helpful towards professional preparation but would wish that students would be better informed about courses, program at Institute, etc. before they travel half way across the U.S. or all the way cross country to attend a FL Institute. Finally, I believe that summer institutes are one of the best helps to better teachers of tomorrow!

The NDEA Institute has certainly been a great factor in increasing my fluency in the FL. I have definitely profited from the seven weeks in which the FL was spoken and the atmosphere that it has created was very conducive to get the "feel" for the language. Also of invaluable importance, have been the teaching methods and practice teaching with the high school students. This has been a very profitable summer for me and I look forward with enthusiam to teaching, thanks to the NDEA Institute.

The only course not very useful was the cultural history course and its half-hour discussion period. We spent about an hour on what the culture is today and that should have taken the greatest part of our time - history we can read in books! Also the way we were tested was not carefully thought out - the tests were sloppily put together and could not have shown what was actually learned.

The writing classes were not coordinated and sometimes my prof didn't know what to do.

In general, the program is a good one, a necessary one, too. The opportunity to constantly speak a foreign language was the best help for me.

One thing I would add - I have decided because of this Institute, not to teach on the secondary level, but on the college level. The AIM-Method is too boring - I couldn't stand to teach it five periods a day. (But I know it works best so far.) Maybe the teaching methods should incorporate other methods, too, not just one. Or maybe I'm just not cut out for secondary school teaching.

For those who do go on to teach in secondary schools, however, the program was excellent.

I think, the NDEA Institute for undergraduates is a tremendous help to any college student to receive a professional preparation of this type, and I can say, that I received a great deal of help in this Institute. It also gave me some idea about the profession I'm about to enter, made me feel more at home with the whole matter, and inspired me a great deal for the FL teaching. I hope that many more students will have this wonderful opportunity.

The program has been very helpful to me in a number of ways. First of all, the linguistics course and the teaching methods course are not given at my college and I think that having had them helps me to gain greater insight into both the FL and English; I am more aware of sounds and of how people learn them than I have ever been before. The campus provided an ideal "language island" and a warm and enthusiastic atmosphere prevailed throughout the seven weeks. The students felt uninhibited and those who already spoke fluently spoke even more easily. The professors and assistants were most helpful. I am very happy that I was able to participate.

I found the Institute especially valuable, in that it acquainted me with the methods of teaching a FL to a much greater extent than would have been possible at most universities. The introduction to teaching aids will be very beneficial in my teaching career. Thanks to the native speakers, who were our instructors, we were introduced to many aspects of the foreign culture which can be put to use in classroom teaching. On the whole I feel that it is a very valuable program for future FL teachers.

I found this Institute very valuable and hope that other undergraduates will have the opportunity to participate in similar Institutes. Our constant exposure to the FL was very useful and stimulating. Many of the courses given here are not available in my home college and in addition these courses are organized so that they reinforce and enrich one another.

I have not gained as much from these seven weeks as I could have, mainly because, although there was a heavy schedule and much foreign language spoken, there was not, among the students, an atmosphere of real interest in the culture.

I would suggest that those on the admissions committee concentrate on getting the best students who apply, instead of trying to get the best distribution according to geography and school. I would also suggest closer attention to the presentation of the audio-lingual method, because, although the teaching done in the demonstration classes was decent, the general level of the reading materials and discussion of the method, was not.

Although I have had a course in the new programed learning method, I was completely unsure of how to use the new techniques. The Institute gave me the opportunity to practice teaching and to feel comfortable in a method to which I was strongly opposed. I was shown how well the new methods of teaching a foreign language work if they are correctly used.

The constant use of the FL (we did not speak English unless it was absolutely necessary) has improved not only my accent, but also vocabulary and grammar.

I am very enthusiastic about this new program for undergraduate students. I firmly believe that good teaching practices should be acquired before a teacher begins to instruct, and before bad practices become habit.

The program is a unique and excellent opportunity for students intending to be secondary school teachers. It should be expanded, so that more students may participate.

This program has greatly improved my proficiency in the use of the spoken tongue. The methodology course and the composition course were extremely interesting. The speech practice classes have helped us all to better pronunciation.

However, I believe that it might be improved, were less "book work" and more simple conversation practice introduced. Also, lecturers should be selected who are willing and able to moderate the pace and technicality of the discussion to the ability of listeners whose mastery of the language is not quite complete. Less should be attempted, and more should be thoroughly learned.

I'm glad I had the chance to come to the Institute. As a result of Dr. X's class I'm eager to teach. But I'm puzzled about the poor teaching to which we were exposed - we, the future teachers. I'm surprised that the individual classes were not coordinated - in terms of subject matter and approach.

The atmosphere was pleasant, and the FL was spoken because of the inner discipline of the students, not as the result of outward compulsion.

The most important aspect of the Institute was the knowledge I have gained in how a language can most successfully be taught. Although language learning takes a considerable amount of practice, I was not aware that it is necessary to emphasize pattern drills as much as they were in the Institute. I know I have profited from my experience.

It is impossible for me to compare this Institute with my university program in some areas as I have not studied professional preparation or linguistics there. The program here was successful. Opportunities in speaking the language were the next best thing to living in the country.

The Institute is worthwhile and should be continued. However, there's always improvement.

The classwork did not always complement the other classes. The majority of students here were obviously not chosen on the basis of their desire to become teachers, rather on grades; therefore the majority of the students desire to continue on after the BA degree to study. This, of course, doesn't help the teaching profession - this is the result of taking the best students from the universities, who will receive opportunity to continue their education - and would be foolish not to do so.

The course which bothered me personally most was phonetics - the teacher spoke the FL (naturally) but the textbook was in English! The problem of terminology was quite bad. Worse, however, was the fact that the teacher disagreed with most everything in the book. I was more confused at the end than at the beginning.

In the Institute, explication de texte was the only time we discussed literature; but that's not a criticism, since we all had taken many courses at our own schools. Also, music and art weren't stressed in culture course because we all have studied this and can study it easily on our own.

The most worthwhile experience is living in the language house with the natives and continuing speaking the language. Particular weakness: program is too intensive for the seven weeks.

I have not done my practice teaching yet, but I'll be doing it this fall on the elementary level. I think it will greatly help me.

My campus doesn't have a very good language department. Only three advanced FL courses are taught each semester. These classes are rather large and there is no time for individual attention. Also, we have no phonetics courses and our methods course encompasses French, Spanish and German, so individual attention can hardly be given to each one.

I feel the Institute was a tremendous help to me.

I consider this NDEA Institute to have been an extremely valuable experience. I feel that I will be a much better teacher because of this course.

My teachers have made me more aware of the vast quantity of knowledge that remains for me to attain. This program, I think, has been an aid to my speaking, listening, reading, writing, and cultural understanding abilities.

I feel the Institute was a valuable awakening to the broad field of language learning - its exciting possibilities - our own ignorance and motivation to go forward and try new ideas.

I would like to say that the experience I have gained this summer has been most invaluable. I am very much in favor of continuing undergraduate institutes, and think that their number should be expanded if at all possible. The experience consisted not only of "academic" learning but the opportunity to work with students whose level of interest in the FL was high.

I would like to say that this Institute was most valuable to me and I feel that I am much more prepared to teach after this excellent training.

Every moment of this experience was worth it. The staff was exceptionally friendly and well prepared in their fields.

The Institute has been very valuable for me. I came from a very small college and never had the opportunity to have a native speaker as a teacher. I had had the same teacher for all my courses, so it has been a real experience for me here. I haven't studied as hard as I do during the school year but I think I have become a better person for coming here, which is also important for a teacher. The individual attention that was given was perhaps what pleased me the most. The only complaint that I have is with the language lab, which was never open on time.

My home campus has no special program for teachers, and I have only studied literature, philosophy, art, music, etc. with no language work *per se*.

The Institute was a delightful experience. Its greatest contribution to me was a demonstration of the interest and challenge in a career as FL teacher - so enthusiasm was created and new ideas about teaching possibilities. These were by no means available at my college. They have convinced me to really *become* an FL teacher.

The Institute has afforded me an insight into the intricacies of being a successful foreign language teacher. The wealth of knowledge I have acquired here is *astounding*. Without such a program I know that I could never teach *effectively*.

While so many colleges in our country are still unprepared to prepare foreign language students, I think that this program is a must. The organization was perfect and one could really improve language skills. And for gaining skills as a teacher, this program was invaluable. By demonstration alone, one could really become oriented as to how a class should operate.

I don't think that I could walk into the classroom next year for my practice teaching without the help I received at the Institute.

All in all it was a tremendous experience.

The Institute has been one of the most valuable experiences I have ever had - from the point of view of a student of the FL, of a future FL teacher, and as a person.

The opportunity to live in what was almost a different culture was invaluable and can never be duplicated on college campuses where students study four to six different subjects at once.

As an over-all, one sentence evaluation, I felt my undergraduate Institute was very valuable - especially because I had this opportunity before beginning teaching.

This Institute has been of great value to me - I feel I have gained an infinitely clearer picture of exactly what is involved in the learning of a foreign language. I am so much better prepared to do my student teaching this fall and have been given a background in all areas so that I now can expand and improve this foundation. What a wonderful experience!

We had to run from class to class all day long, then attend meetings in the evening. There was no time to study or to absorb and think about what we had done in class. We were too tired and frustrated to participate effectively in the conversation classes, which I believe should have had the most emphasis, because this is the area where most of us needed the most work. There were too many theory classes, too much observation, and not enough experience in actually teaching. Each participant taught only once for five minutes!

The phonetics and linguistics classes were maddeningly boring. There should have been fewer lecture classes and more individual work.

But on the whole the program was extremely helpful; especially, having a chance to meet and speak with native speakers on the staff.

On the whole, the program has been tremendously valuable and has given me a foundation for future study.

I think that the program is highly valuable in that it has given me a sort of professional enthusiasm. I know now what a challenge the field will be and how much there is to learn to be a good teacher. I also have learned just what kind of teacher I want to be.

On the whole I found the Institute as a fantastic experience. I feel that I have greatly increased my speaking proficiency in the language. I feel much more self-confident now about going into the teaching field. The methodology classes were excellent.

The native-speaking assistants at my particular Institute deserve special praise, I think. They took part in all of our activities and they were always available to help us. They were also quite animated and charming. They were very important in that they helped greatly to keep up the morale of the participants.

The undergraduate Institute was certainly the best way to improve language proficiency and to create an awareness of a foreign culture. It has been a most rewarding and worthwhile experience for me. I do think, however, that we should have been made to sign a pledge, promising not to use English except in extreme situations. Many participants slid back into their vernacular, which tends to defeat the whole purpose of being immersed in the foreign culture. But this is only a small area, and the benefits to be gained far outweigh whatever criticisms there may be.

The Institute as a whole was certainly one of the most valuable experiences I have ever had, or shall ever have.

This NDEA Language Institute was very valuable to me for several reasons.

As far as my future profession goes, I know I am now better qualified to teach a foreign language on any level.

Attitudes formed as a result of a culture and civilization course, and in particular, through contact with native people, have given me a broader outlook not only on one culture but on all cultures.

As a result of this Institute, I have also gained a certain fluency in French that would never have been possible otherwise.

Observation and practice teaching exist in my university. However, my major is elementary education with extensive credits in FL, since I am interested in FLES. No practice or observation of FLES exists on my campus. The departments of language and education are completely separated. Elementary education is even a separate branch within the education department! This may be a major reason why, of the 20,000 students at my university, I am the only one interested in FLES.

FL majors at my school receive a rich background in literature, a names-dates-and-places type culture course, and an advanced grammar course. Those who will teach are required by the education department to take sociology and psychology of education, and student teaching. There is no course in language methods, text analysis, applied linguistics, phonetics, etc. In the classes, professors speak only the FL and require excellence in critical papers in the FL. However, students practically never speak the language, except a two-line question on a literary topic. There is no provision for correcting pronunciation. Tapes in the language laboratory exist only for the first-year course.

For these reasons, the NDEA Institute was invaluable to me. Without it, I would not have taught a language in elementary school. At least I had the common sense to know I was not prepared. But to tell the truth, it wasn't until after a week at the Institute that I began to really grasp how unprepared I was. Seven weeks have not made a FLES teacher of me. But they have given me an essential push in the right direction.

I have greatly benefited from this Institute, especially in the fields of linguistics and phonetics, fields which were before now completely unknown to me.

NDEA Institutes are the best things in the world. In those seven weeks I learned more than I did in the whole academic year.

In the Institute where Dr. X. conducted the methods class, I feel that he more than adequately built our understanding of the audio-lingual approach, for he erased any doubt and skepticism of this approach which is so often found in our secondary schools today.

Frankly, I feel that there was far too much emphasis on the teaching of the language and far too little on the language itself. I realize that this Institute was meant to prepare people to teach, but in order to teach a language, one must first know the language, and many of the participants did not know the language and I rather doubt that they learned it well enough to teach it.

The linguistics and the literature teachers were magnificent, and the native assistants were invaluable. I frankly thought the demonstration class was a waste of time.

This Institute was a very valuable experience for me because I was exposed to things that I cannot find at my university.

The atmosphere which automatically prevails among 40 young people with a similar interest and similar goals is a most convivial, as well as educational one. And the experience with the spoken language (being required to speak the FL at all times) is of almost equal value to a visit to the country in which the FL is natively spoken.

I both enjoyed and benefited greatly from my Institute.

A large univeristy, such as I attended, does not often see the need to perfect or coordinate a language program. Therefore, there are broken lines of communication between the School of Education and the language department itself. My school has a program much superior to those programs of other schools in this area, but the concentrated Institute experience is far ahead.

My own campus (experience) provides little or no practice of speaking skills. Yet, I found them so necessary in my teaching.

In the Institute my poor speaking ability placed me in the bottom group. Explanation as to why I was put there was not clear and I almost went home the first week. Later, friends told me that they too experienced this "idiot" feeling.

I had a feeling of belonging. Everything was extremely well organized, but yet we never had the feeling we were just being herded around or just another number. The classes were coordinated with each other, and we had the feeling that the professors really cared about us and not about the next paper they had to publish. The social aspect was also valuable and not forced. Having fun with the staff (who seemed to enjoy the frequent and informal gatherings) made the class work more enjoyable. All in all the Institute was an exciting and inspirational event and undoubtedly of much importance in my preparation as a teacher.

I think the program is much more effective than any university can hope to offer during the academic year because of (a) the choice faculty that was gathered together for one summer, (b) the intensity of a highly integrated course of study - it extended beyond the classroom.

The most important thing that the Institute offered and which is difficult to establish on campus was the feeling of unity among faculty and participant and the professional atmosphere maintained. I came to the Institute very interested in FL teaching but rather unknowing about it and left feeling that I really knew what was FL teaching. The demonstration classes were invaluable and impossible to duplicate on a small campus like mine. The exposure to many teaching methods, books, materials and distinguished speakers is something my college would enthusiastically support but it is very difficult to schedule or arrange at a small college since the FL major cannot devote full time to the language during the year and a small college does not have the resources necessary.

I would hate to think of being a language teacher without having been to the NDEA Institute.

Students (high school students, especially) are hardly infants. Why should we insult their intelligence by treating them as parrots? Such were the three levels of demonstration classes that we observed. The students sat there, bored as could be while the teacher was racing back and forth across the room to lead the drill. Students are curious. They like to look at a book and figure things out for themselves. Why deprive them of this?

Another "waste of time" was the linguistics class. It would have been fine were it taught either completely in English or in the FL but not in a combination. What a fiasco that was - trying to think in both languages at once! The instructor was just as confused as we were.

The study of contemporary institutions offered in our Institute was the most complete and one of the most valuable courses I've ever taken.

I no longer plan to go into secondary teaching. I decided that a lifetime of teaching nothing but the basic fundamentals of a FL would be horribly sterile. I am much too interested in the literature, history and culture of a foreign country. Therefore, I have decided to go into college teaching as a specialist in the Modern FL literature. The teaching of basic FL becomes a means to an end and not an end in itself. I am convinced that a college teacher has a far more creative existence than one in a secondary school. I am an intellectual, and I do not belong in a high school or feel at home with many high school language teachers.

I am certain that I will be able to make use of my Institute background, because I will probably be training some high school teachers in the future myself.

The most valuable course at the Institute was for me the methods course coupled with the practice teaching class; for I have not had any similar courses at my own school, although practice teaching is offered. Of the valuable points of the Institute I believe the most important and most helpful of all, which you do not include in the form was the opportunity to sit down in the evening with fellow students and teachers and have what might be called "bull sessions."

These periods of open discussion are the point upon which I feel the Institute should be based. For it is only in such an Institute that the media is there for such discussions. (A language house on campus would be in many ways similar - we do not have such a house.) My college campus was solely a commuter campus, and therefore did not have after school or evening affairs of any sort.

The value of the Institute lay in the relatively small number of members and in the feeling of working with the faculty in classes because of their interest in us as individuals, and our contact with them out of class, in evening and social activities, where we got to know them better. I think the Institute was invaluable because it allowed us to be individuals.

Appendix D

A NOTE ON THE USE OF THE TERMS "POSITIVE" AND "NEGATIVE" IN SECTION II

The tables in Section II of this report, presenting the questionnaire data, use the terms "positive," "negative," "highly positive," and "highly negative." Since these terms did not appear in the Questionnaire itself, their use in the tables ought to be explained.

The terms "highly positive" and "highly negative" are immediately clear and their use should raise no question. Whenever a student responded H for a particular feature or activity of the Institute, we regarded this as a "highly positive" reaction. The direction reads: "Encircle H if you believe the Institute activity was HIGHLY VALUABLE to you." Whenever a student encircled X for either Institute feature or one on his home campus, we interpreted this reaction as "highly negative." The direction for encircling X under Institute activities reads: "Encircle X if the activity described was not practiced to any appreciable degree at your Institute." Likewise, under home campus activities, the direction reads in similar fashion: "Encircle X if the activity described was not practiced to any appreciable degree in your own campus program."

The general instruction for responding to items regarding the home campus reads as follows: "Would you focus on your own campus this past year and consider the training program there for prospective teachers like yourself." We asked the student to focus not only on his own direct personal home campus experience but on his full knowledge of the training program given there for prospective FL teachers. We assumed that since he was about to enter his senior year or had already completed the senior year (1965 Institute participants answered our Questionnaire in the summer of 1966), he would be quite well acquainted with the program for prospective language teachers on his home campus.

We felt justified in using the term "positive" if the response was either H or M. The student was asked to encircle H if he believed the Institute activity was "highly valuable" and M if he believed it was "moderately valuable". Thus the term "positive" does not merely mean that the feature merely existed in the Institute program; it means that the respondents found the particular feature or activity valuable enough to them to encircle either H or M. The criterion for judging whether a given feature or activity was "valuable" is given in the directions: "To what extent do you believe that the particular activity will have contributed to your future success as a language teacher?" It is to be noted that we did not interpret

Response L (in the H,M,L,X series) as "positive" even though it did indicate that the feature or activity actually existed.

> Example: Questionnaire Item 3 states that the Institute program required or encouraged participants to spend a good deal of time in the language laboratory. 92% of the participants responded that this was the case, but only 73% responded H or M - that is, that this activity was "highly" or "moderately" valuable to them. 18% responded L - that is, that this activity was of "little" value to them. Hence the figure given in the table under the term "positive" is 73%. The 30% listed as "highly positive" were the ones who responded H.

The term "positive" therefore means

a) that the feature or activity existed in the program, AND

b) that it was found to be valuable for the participants as prospective teachers.

The word "negative" is used in a more complex way and some readers will feel that we are, perhaps, taking liberties with the term. "Negative" does not mean that the respondent necessarily made an unfavorable judgment. The G,E,L,X responses do not ask for a judgment; they ask merely for a description of a certain kind. But we ourselves have chosen to interpret both the L and X responses - in terms of our criteria - as "negative." Some readers may find that we have been too severe by counting L responses (in the G,E,L, X series) as "negative." That may be so. Our only counter argument is that the overall picture of the contrasts between Institute programs and home campus programs shown by "positive" percentages vs. "negative" percentages is corroborated by the "highly positive" percentages vs. the "highly negative" percentages. In the latter contrasts, the figures are entirely unambiguous.